

MINUTES OF THE
MAG MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
March 11, 2009
MAG Office Building - Saguaro Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Rogene Hill for Charlie McClendon, Avondale	Christopher Brady, Mesa
Mark Pentz, Chandler, Vice Chair	Jim Bacon, Paradise Valley
# Matt Busby for George Hoffman,	Carl Swenson, Peoria
Apache Junction	Frank Fairbanks, Phoenix
David Johnson for Jeanine Guy, Buckeye	John Kross, Queen Creek
Jon Pearson, Carefree	* Bryan Meyers, Salt River Pima-Maricopa
Wayne Anderson for Usama Abujbarah,	Indian Community
Cave Creek	John Little, Scottsdale
Pat Dennis for B.J. Cornwall, El Mirage	# Michael Celaya for Randy Oliver, Surprise
Alfonso Rodriguez for Phil Dorchester,	Charlie Meyer, Tempe
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	Reyes Medrano, Tolleson
* Rick Davis, Fountain Hills	Gary Edwards, Wickenburg
* Rick Buss, Gila Bend	Lloyce Robinson, Youngtown
David White, Gila River Indian Community	John Halikowski, ADOT
George Pettit, Gilbert	Kenny Harris for David Smith, Maricopa
Jessica Blazina for Ed Beasley, Glendale	County
John Fischbach, Goodyear	Mike Taylor for David Boggs,
RoseMary Arellano, Guadalupe	Valley Metro/RPTA
Darryl Crossman, Litchfield Park	

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Participated by telephone conference call.

+ Participated by videoconference call.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Mark Pentz at 12:10 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Michael Celaya and Matt Busby joined the meeting via teleconference.

Vice Chair Pentz introduced two new members to the Management Committee: David White from the Gila River Indian Community, and John Halikowski from ADOT. Mr. White and Mr. Halikowski both expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to serve on the Committee.

Vice Chair Pentz noted that materials for agenda items #5B, #6B, #6C, #7, #8 and #10 were at each place.

Vice Chair Pentz announced that parking garage validation and transit tickets were available from Valley Metro/RPTA for those using transit to come to the meeting.

3. Call to the Audience

Vice Chair Pentz stated that Call to the Audience provides an opportunity to the public to address the Management Committee on items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non-action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Vice Chair Pentz noted that those wishing to comment on agenda items posted for action will be provided the opportunity at the time the item is heard. Public comments have a three minute time limit and there is a timer to help the public with their presentations. He noted that no public comment cards had been received.

4. Executive Director's Report

Dennis Smith, MAG Executive Director, reported to the Management Committee on items of interest to the MAG region. He stated that Governor Brewer was informed by the Federal Transit Administration that the 2007 MAG Human Services Coordination Transportation Plan and the 2008 Update had won the United We Ride National Leadership Award. Mr. Smith noted that the MAG Plan, which coordinates the non profit organizations that receive federal funding, was ranked number one out of 45 plans submitted. Mr. Smith acknowledged the efforts of Amy St. Peter and DeDe Gaisthea.

Vice Chair Pentz thanked Mr. Smith for his report. No questions for Mr. Smith were noted.

5. Approval of Consent Agenda

Vice Chair Pentz stated that agenda items #5A, #5B, #5C, #5D, #5E, and #5F were on the Consent Agenda. He reviewed the public comment guidelines for the Consent Agenda. He noted that no public comment cards had been received.

Vice Chair Pentz asked if any member of the Committee had questions or a request to have a presentation on any Consent Agenda item.

Mr. Little requested a report on agenda item #5F.

Mr. Smith stated that the Brookings Intermountain Study and the ASU Sun Corridor Study are two goals included in the MAG Work Program that were presented to the Executive Committee in January. He explained that the Intermountain Study acknowledges that forces impacting MAG

region go beyond our borders. He said that MAG has a lot in common with the Intermountain West, especially Denver, Salt Lake City, and Las Vegas. Mr. Smith stated that the Brookings Institute has identified the Intermountain West as the fastest growing part of the United States. This proposal deals with how MAG could form alliances with other states that could be advantageous. Mr. Smith stated that Brookings has requested \$20,000 from each state for the study. He said that he had discussed the study with the Central Arizona Association of Governments and the Pima Association of Governments and they are willing to participate on a population basis.

Mr. Smith stated that the Sun Corridor Study was discussed by the Executive Committee and the discussion went back and forth. One viewpoint was to focus attention on Maricopa County because there is a lot of work to do here; the other viewpoint indicated that we already are being impacted by Pinal County, in areas such as the MAG travel demand model, the eight-hour ozone boundary, and the socioeconomic platform modeling.

Mr. Smith reported that the Executive Committee thought MAG should participate in both studies. He said that ASU indicated it could do a brief study for \$12,000 and this is an opportunity to have a neutral party attend a meeting of MAG, and Pima and Pinal Counties in Casa Grande and look at opportunities for all three counties. Mr. Smith advised that there is the concern that once a toe is put in the water, you could be looking at an infrastructure plan for a three-county area. He commented that this is a legitimate concern because there is not a large tax base in Pinal County, and MAG does not want to be a donor.

Mr. Smith indicated that in his opinion relationships with the other counties need to be established. He said that this was apparent when MAG was outvoted at the State Transportation Board meeting. Mr. Smith commented that while the counties have relationships at the technical level, there are limited relationships established at the political level, and there is a need to sit down and discuss joint interests. Mr. Smith noted that if the Management Committee desired, he would request that the Executive Committee remove these two goals from the Work Program, and continue the focus on Maricopa County alone.

Mr. Little explained that he requested a report because he wanted to have this discussion. He indicated his respect for the Brookings Institute and their work, and benefits from that type of collaboration could be derived, but he was concerned for creating any expectation of funding of infrastructure needs. Mr. Little commented that the MAG region has a difficult time funding its own infrastructure needs, and creating expectations outside the MAG area is worthy of discussion.

Mr. Fairbanks stated that ASU is a wonderful organization and a great partner, but it is the greatest supporter of the Sun Corridor concept and he did not think ASU is objective.

Mr. Pettit moved to recommend approval of Consent Agenda items #5A, #5B, #5C, #5D, #5E, and #5F. Mr. Kross seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

5A. Approval of February 11, 2009, Meeting Minutes

The Management Committee by consent, approved the February 11, 2009, meeting minutes.

5B. Amendment of the FY 2009 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to Accept FY 2009 Federal Highway Administration Planning Funding

The Management Committee by consent, recommended amending the FY 2009 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to accept \$134,537.35 of FY 2009 Federal Highway Administration Planning Funding. Each year, MAG prepares a Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget that lists anticipated revenues for the coming year. On February 10, 2009, MAG was notified by the Arizona Department of Transportation that MAG received an additional amount of \$134,537.35 of FY 2009 Federal Highway Administration Planning (PL) funding. An amendment to the FY 2009 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget is needed to include this additional amount.

5C. Consultant Selection for the MAG Activity-Based Travel Forecasting Model Development (Phase I)

The Management Committee by consent, recommended that PB Americas, Inc. be selected to conduct the MAG Development of Activity-based Travel Forecasting Model (ABM) - Phase I for an amount not to exceed \$270,000. If negotiations with PB Americas, Inc. are not successful, that MAG negotiate with its second choice, Cambridge Systematics, Inc., to conduct the project. In May 2008, the MAG Regional Council approved the FY 2009 Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget, which included \$270,000 to conduct a first phase of the development of activity-based travel forecasting model (ABM) as a part of the ongoing contracts for on-call consulting services for transportation modeling. The project will ensure that current and future travel forecasting needs are addressed in a timely manner and will allow MAG to implement a new generation of the travel forecasting models that is required by emerging planning needs in the region. On December 18, 2008, MAG issued a Request for Proposals to conduct the study to the consultants pre-qualified through the on-call support contractual process. In response, three proposals were received. A multi-agency review team met on February 27, 2009, and recommended to MAG the selection of PB Americas, Inc. to conduct the development. In addition, the team recommended that if negotiations with PB Americas, Inc. on the task order are not successful, that MAG pursue negotiations with its second choice, Cambridge Systematics, Inc.

5D. Conformity Consultation

The Maricopa Association of Governments is conducting consultation on a conformity assessment for an administrative modification to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The proposed administrative modification involves several Arizona Department of Transportation projects as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, including projects on Interstate-10, Interstate-17, and US 60. The administrative modification includes minor project revisions that do not require a conformity determination. This item was on the agenda for consultation.

5E. 2009 MAG Human Services Coordination Transportation Plan Update

The Management Committee by consent, recommended approval of the 2009 MAG Human Services Coordination Transportation Plan Update. The federal Safe and Efficient Transportation

Equity Act - A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) requires the establishment of a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan for all Federal Transit Administration (FTA) programs for underserved populations: the Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities program (Section 5310); the Job Access and Reverse Commute program (Section 5316); and the New Freedom program (Section 5317). MAG has developed this coordination plan each year in compliance with this requirement since 2007. The MAG Regional Council approved the 2008 Plan in January 2008. The 2009 MAG Human Services Coordination Transportation Plan Update was recommended for approval by the MAG Human Services Technical Committee on February 12, 2009.

5F. Amendment of the FY 2009 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to Include Funding to Participate in a Brookings Intermountain Study and to Include Funding to Have Arizona State University North American Center for Transborder Studies Provide Research Regarding the Global Competitiveness of Arizona and the Sun Corridor

The Management Committee by consent, recommended amending the FY 2009 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to include up to \$20,000 of MAG federal funds if needed to participate with the Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program on an Intermountain partnership and amending the Work Program to include up to \$12,000 of MAG federal funds if needed to have the Arizona State University Center for Transborder Studies to conduct a study to describe the global and North America forces that impact the MAG region and the Sun Corridor. The Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program is proposing a partnership with leading Intermountain West institutions and leaders to work out specific collaborative steps among the five "Mountain Megs" (and their states) to advance prosperity in their region through the achievement of specific, catalyzing federal policy reforms. Brookings is seeking approximately \$20,000 from the Mountain Mega states to convene working groups and conduct the research. MAG is estimating that 74.51 percent would be needed (\$14,902) if MAG, the Pima Association of Governments and the Central Arizona Association of Governments participated. If this participation did not occur, up to \$20,000 from MAG would be needed.

For the Sun Corridor area, the Arizona State University North American Center for Transborder Studies has proposed to describe the global and North America forces that impact MAG and vice versa. This paper would be the first iteration to conduct the planning analysis necessary to develop Maricopa County, the Sun Corridor and then the Intermountain West as more than just infrastructure and transportation, but as a job creation and economic "cluster." Staff, consulting and associated expense are estimated to be \$12,000. MAG is estimating that 74.51 percent would be needed (\$8,942) if MAG, the Pima Association of Governments and the Central Arizona Association of Governments participated. If this participation did not occur, up to \$12,000 from MAG would be needed.

6A. ADOT Portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funds

Eric Anderson, MAG Transportation Director, reported that on February 20, 2009, the State Transportation Board considered the allocation of about \$349 million, which is the ADOT portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds. He stated that the Board allocated 37 percent to the MAG region, 13 percent to the PAG region, and 50 percent to the

remainder of the Arizona Counties. Mr. Anderson stated that on February 25, 2009, the Regional Council approved a prioritized list of projects totaling approximately \$194 million for MAG's portion of the ADOT ARRA funds. He noted that most of the projects are part of Proposition 400, and added that some of the lower ranked projects were pavement rehabilitation projects.

Mr. Anderson stated that in 2006, the Legislature allocated \$307 million for the Statewide Transportation Acceleration Needs (STAN) account, and 60 percent of the \$307 million was allocated to the MAG region. Mr. Anderson stated that in January 2009, to balance the state budget, the Legislature swept \$104 million left in the STAN account that had not been obligated, of which \$94 million was for projects in the MAG region. Mr. Anderson noted that the I-10 and I-17 projects were ready to obligate in October 2008, and if the bids had been advertised, the projects would have been obligated and the Legislature would not have been able to sweep the funds.

Mr. Anderson stated that MAG was looking for some fairness by the State Transportation Board in its allocations. He said that during his testimony at the Board Study Session in February, he suggested that the MAG region be held harmless, especially with the I-10 and I-17 projects, which MAG did not know were being held until it was too late. On February 20, the Board went ahead with no discussion and allocated 37 percent to the MAG region.

Mr. Anderson then explained three bar charts that showed options for the allocation of ADOT stimulus funds. The first bar chart was the unanimous State Transportation Board action on February 20, 2009, to allocate about \$129.5 million to MAG. He noted that this allocation did not include any funds to replace the STAN funds that were swept. Mr. Anderson stated that the second bar chart showed the \$188.7 million the MAG region would have received if the region had been held harmless from the STAN sweep. He explained that MAG staff recommended that the \$94 million be taken off the allocation ADOT receives, then the remainder would be split according to the RAAC allocation. Mr. Anderson stated that the third bar chart showed an allocation to MAG of about \$176 million, about \$46 million more than the Board allocated. He noted that the \$176 million included the I-10 and I-17 projects that were ready to obligate in October 2008, but were held specifically so that the funds would be available for a sweep by the Legislature to balance the budget. Mr. Anderson stated that this was the option that was recommended by ADOT staff to the State Transportation Board.

Mr. Anderson stated that in addition to MAG's testimony at the February Study Session, MAG staff also testified at the March 3, 2009, Board meeting that applying the formula, which is used by the Resource Allocation Advisory Committee (RAAC) to allocate ADOT Discretionary Funds, was an inappropriate use for new funds. Mr. Anderson commented that the RAAC probably should have been convened to make a recommendation on the stimulus funds.

Mr. Anderson explained some of the key indicators between MAG, PAG and the other 13 counties. He pointed out MAG's 37 percent share of the ADOT stimulus funds and MAG's sub-allocated share of \$88 million. Mr. Anderson said that gas sales in Maricopa County represent 59.5 percent of the sales statewide and Maricopa County accounts for 60 percent of the population. Mr. Anderson noted that 78 percent of the construction jobs lost statewide were lost

in Maricopa County. He pointed out that these figures demonstrate the disproportionate impact of the economic downturn on Maricopa County.

Mr. Anderson displayed a map of the prioritized projects approved by the Regional Council on February 25th. He noted that most of the freeway projects are on the west side because those are the projects that meet the criteria of being ready to go. Mr. Anderson noted that 50 percent of ADOT's funds need to obligate in 120 days, and 100 percent within one year of enactment (February 17, 2010). He noted that these are the five projects that are moving forward in the process. Mr. Anderson stated that the five projects total about \$131 million, which is close to the \$129.5 million allocated to MAG. He added that this is part of agenda item #7, to make the necessary TIP adjustments for the funding amounts.

Chair Pentz asked for clarification that had ADOT obligated the STAN projects in Fall 2008, the MAG region would have more stimulus money to allocate to other projects in the region. Mr. Anderson replied that was correct and the MAG region would have about \$73 million more funding.

Mr. Smith clarified that the new ADOT Director and ADOT staff recommended to the State Transportation Board that the STAN amount be taken off the top of the stimulus funds. He noted that these projects were held in October 2008 and MAG did not find out until January 2009. Mr. Smith stated that MAG did its best to communicate the 78 percent construction job loss, but was unsuccessful in convincing the Board of the need in Maricopa County. He noted that elected officials who were at the meeting reported to him that they did not know the hostility on the Board toward Maricopa County was so bad.

It was noted that no action on this agenda item was required.

6B. MAG Sub-Allocation Portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funds Project and Allocation Scenarios

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) legislation sub-allocates 30 percent of the funding (\$156.57 million) to local jurisdictions. Eileen Yazzie, MAG Transportation Program Manager, stated that the ARRA funds can be used on projects that meet the federal criteria of Surface Transportation Program and Transportation Enhancement Funds. She reported that MAG just was notified by ADOT and FHWA that the MAG sub-allocation portion of the ARRA funds is anticipated to be \$104.6 million, an increase of about \$15 million over the \$88 million previously thought. She advised that the \$104.6 million amount is still draft. Ms. Yazzie stated that the ARRA funds have a "use it or lose it" provision in which ADOT has 120 days to obligate 50 percent of its funds and transit has 180 days to obligate 50 percent of its funds from the March 10, 2009, date of enactment. She noted that MAG does not have this short-term provision, and all three groups must obligate 100 percent of its funds within one year. Ms. Yazzie stated that one year is a quick turnaround to complete the federal clearance processes.

Ms. Yazzie stated that the reporting requirements on the ARRA funds are still under revision by FHWA. She noted that transparency is one of the goals of President Obama and reports will be posted on www.recovery.gov.

Ms. Yazzie stated that at its February meeting, the Transportation Policy Committee requested that scenarios for the MAG sub-allocation be developed. She stated that the proposed scenarios, not in any priority order, are: Scenario #1 - Member agency allocation with different base amounts; Scenario #2 - Highway projects not funded by the ADOT allocation; Scenario #3 - Highway and Arterial (ALCP) projects; Scenario #4 - Combination of Highway, Arterial and Transit projects; Scenario #5 - Projects ready to go that are in the TIP, whether Proposition 400 or not, and are non-highway and non-transit projects.

Ms. Yazzie stated that Scenario #1A calculates a minimum agency allocation and then adds population to the minimum agency allocation. Scenario #1B provides jurisdictions with a minimum agency allocation and calculates population distribution after the minimum agency allocations are provided. She stated that in Scenario #1, member agencies would need to make a decision on which Option, A or B, and the minimum agency allocation. Ms. Yazzie stated that jurisdictions would have to identify specific projects for the use of the economic recovery funds with a possible quick deadline, and added that she believed member agency staff has already done the ground work to identify eligible projects. She advised that projects that would require a lengthy NEPA/environmental review process are not good candidates for these funds.

Ms. Yazzie stated that Scenario #2 includes only Proposition 400 Highway projects, and she noted that the Regional Council already made a decision to fund five of the projects with the ADOT portion of the ARRA funds. Ms. Yazzie noted that the TIP modification would be addressed in agenda item #7. Ms. Yazzie stated that seven Freeway/Highway ADOT projects, totaling \$43.1 million, and approved in priority order by the Regional Council, are not funded by the ADOT portion of the ARRA funds. She stated that there are also three Proposition 400 projects, non-prioritized by the Regional Council and totaling \$160.5 million, that remain. She displayed the projects on a map. Ms. Yazzie advised that if Scenario #2 is recommended, a decision on which projects to fund with ARRA funds would be needed, and she added that there are more projects than available funding.

Ms. Yazzie stated that Scenario #3 incorporates Scenario #2, but adds Proposition 400 Street projects to the Highway projects. She explained that there are four ALCP Projects totaling about \$50 million that are ready to go and another four ALCP Projects totaling about \$103 million that possibly could become ready by utilizing the consultants in the Local Government Section at ADOT. Ms. Yazzie displayed the projects on a map and advised that once again, there are more projects than available funding. She stated that if Scenario #3 is recommended, a decision would be needed on which projects to fund with ARRA funds.

Ms. Yazzie stated that Scenario #4 includes the projects in Scenario #2 and Scenario #3, and also includes Proposition 400 Transit projects that are not recommended for funding by RPTA. She advised that the list of transit projects is still under development by RPTA. Ms. Yazzie mentioned that if Scenario #4 is recommended, a decision would be needed on which projects to fund with ARRA funds.

Ms. Yazzie stated that Scenario #5 has three funding options and includes projects that are ready to go. She said that the amount needed to fund projects in the TIP Status A and NEPA Status A list is \$84 million; the STP-TEA projects raises the needed funding amount to \$95 million; the

projects in the TIP Status A and NEPA Status B list increases the funding need to \$121 million. She said if Scenario #5 is chosen, projects would have to be selected to be funded as the number of candidate projects is higher than the MAG sub-allocated amount.

Vice Chair Pentz thanked Ms. Yazzie for her presentation and asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Medrano asked for clarification how the three non-prioritized Proposition 400 projects in Scenario #2 would be prioritized. Ms. Yazzie responded that in the typical process, the prioritization of the projects would take place through the MAG committee process for final approval by the Regional Council.

Mr. Swenson moved to Approval of Scenario #1, Option A, with a Minimum Agency Allocation of \$500,000 plus population dated March 10, 2009, for the distribution of the MAG Sub-Allocation Portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funds in accordance with the following: 1. Establish a deadline of April 3, 2009, to have MAG member agencies define and submit projects to MAG for the sub-allocated funds due to the very limited time to obligate the projects. 2. Have MAG prepare the necessary administrative adjustments/amendments to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and/or Regional Transportation Plan as appropriate. 3. Have MAG conduct the air quality consultation/conformity if necessary. 4. Establish a deadline of November 30, 2009 for projects to be obligated. Funds from projects that are not obligated will be reprogrammed to meet the federal obligation date of February 17, 2010 in order for Arizona to be eligible to receive funding from other states that are unable to obligate their funds. Mr. Fischbach seconded.

Vice Chair Pentz asked members for discussion of the motion.

Ms. Blazina stated that from the City of Glendale perspective, Glendale supports the allocation of the ARRA funds through the Proposition 400 process and believes that this is the most fair and equitable distribution of funding which provides the most benefit to the most people, and has been voter approved.

Vice Chair Pentz commented that there has been a lot of discussion about the stimulus funds going to infrastructure, and expressed the disappointment that the overall federal package has taken on a different character and was a lot less than anticipated. Vice Chair Pentz stated that the member agencies spent a lot of time submitting projects to MAG and he appreciated the efforts of MAG staff in the coordination. He said that if funding moves forward with only the projects that are shovel ready, a number of communities will not receive any funds, so he supported this motion.

Mr. Crossman stated that \$500,000 plus a population distribution is a decent proposal, but he was concerned that many communities will receive too small a portion to have a significant project, as \$500,000 in today's market will not do much. Mr. Crossman proposed Scenario #1A, but increasing the minimum agency allocation to \$1 million with a population distribution. He explained that on the chart, nine out of 29 communities will receive fewer dollars from this modification, and in order to offset that, he proposed taking the \$15.9 million difference between the previous MAG sub-allocation (\$88 million) and the current MAG sub-allocation (\$104.6

million) and dividing that among the nine communities according to population. Mr. Crossman stated that he thought the \$1 million plus population allocation would enable all communities to have at least one significant project. He stated that Litchfield Road to Luke Air Force Base is in terrible condition, and the \$500,000 will not touch the \$1.6 million needed to fix it. Mr. Crossman stated that the nine communities that would fall short from the change of a \$500,000 base to \$1 million base could take the \$15.9 million and divide that proportionately. He noted that the \$15.9 million would not be divided among all member agencies, just the nine communities. Mr. Crossman stated that Peoria, for example, would receive only \$60,000 less under his proposal.

Mr. Smith referenced Vice Chair Pentz's earlier comments that the stimulus funds were considered by many to be an infrastructure package. He said that the list MAG prepared included all types of projects totaled about \$7.3 billion, with \$5.3 billion being transportation projects. Mr. Smith noted that when all of the stimulus funds – ADOT, the MAG Sub-allocation and Transit – are added up, they total \$300 million, and with that amount, we will have a hard time pleasing everyone in Maricopa County. Mr. Smith added that the goal of the stimulus package was to get people back to work. He stated that another source of funding will become available next month – the closeout of federal funds. He said that MAG hopes to have ready projects, not covered by the Sub-allocation, that could move forward with the closeout funds. Mr. Smith advised that ADOT has staffing issues and MAG hopes to have precise closeout numbers. We need to look at all the federal money, whether stimulus or not, and address projects that are ready to go.

Wayne Anderson stated that the intersection at Cave Creek Road and Carefree Highway needs improvement. He said that it is probably the tenth busiest intersection in the Valley, serves more than four communities, and the bulk of the traffic is from outside Cave Creek. Mr. Anderson said that the design is completed, but Cave Creek has a small population and the amount coming to them will not come close to the \$2.2 million need to do this project.

Vice Chair Pentz asked Mr. Crossman if he intended his proposal as an amended motion. Mr. Crossman replied that he did. Mr. Rodriguez seconded the amended motion.

Mr. Fairbanks expressed that the City of Phoenix enthusiastically supported Scenario #1 as the allocation criteria, because all agencies have seen their HURF revenues declining. He said that if the motion passes, Phoenix intends to use the money for resurfacing and improving its existing streets. Mr. Fairbanks stated that Phoenix has a number of streets with cracks and potholes, due to the wet winter. He said that we need to take care of the people already here and paying taxes by taking care of the existing streets. Mr. Fairbanks stated that it is also prudent financially to do resurfacing early to prevent major costs later by a total reconstruction of a street. He stated his support for Scenario #1A. Mr. Fairbanks stated that all of the scenario alternatives essentially take away money from the large cities and give it to the smaller cities, and Phoenix is willing to do that. He added that Phoenix gives a greater proportion, and if shared fairly on a population basis, under Scenario #1A, Phoenix would take \$4 million to \$5 million out of its pocket and give it to the smaller cities, but it will make the sacrifice. Mr. Fairbanks stated that there are equity issues here, and it seems citizens in Phoenix should have the same rights as the citizens of other cities. He said that there needs to be balance. Phoenix will take some of its fair share and give it to the smaller cities, but there has to be a limit. Mr. Fairbanks stated that Phoenix eliminated 1,100 staff and \$270 million from its budget, which includes massive cuts to its transit and street

maintenance. Mr. Fairbanks stated that large streets, such as Indian School Road, Bell Road, and Greenway Road, cross Phoenix and also serve a lot of people. He expressed that if Phoenix does not get money to resurface its streets, the citizens of the County will be driving on streets with potholes. Mr. Fairbanks stated that Phoenix is happy to support Scenario #1A, which takes \$4 million to \$5 million from Phoenix and gives it to smaller cities, but with a \$1 million base, essentially 60 percent to 70 percent comes out of Phoenix. He said that this is a matter of what is fair and his question was how much more do the citizens of Litchfield Park deserve than the Phoenix citizens? Mr. Fairbanks also noted that the per capita income of Phoenix was lower than that of Litchfield Park. Mr. Fairbanks stated that Phoenix will support Scenario #1A, which takes \$4 million to \$5 million from Phoenix and gives it to smaller communities, but if the base was \$1 million, he was not sure he would be discharging his duty to the citizens of Phoenix.

Mr. Crossman expressed that the Management Committee members understood Mr. Fairbanks' position and they have had to make difficult decisions also. He said that Litchfield Park has had layoffs and cuts to its budget, and even had to eliminate its street program this year. Mr. Crossman stated that there are 29 jurisdictions listed, including the balance of the county. He explained that under the \$1 million base proposal, nine jurisdictions would receive an amount less than they would have gotten under the \$500,000 base. He said that he proposed that benefitting 20 communities and dividing the \$15.9 million among the nine communities that are receiving a lesser amount would offset Mr. Fairbanks' concern, which he respects.

Mr. Fairbanks expressed his appreciation for that accommodation, and asked why all the communities could not share in the \$15.9 million. He stated that as he understood Scenario #1A, all communities would share all of the sub-allocation.

Mr. Crossman stated that \$15.9 would be a small increase to share among so many cities, and the reason he suggested dividing it among nine communities would be to offset the loss from increasing the base of \$500,000 to \$1 million.

Mr. Fischbach expressed his appreciation for Phoenix's position and its willingness to give up for all of the communities. He said that he also appreciated Litchfield Park's position that there are not enough funds to make an impact. Mr. Fischbach stated that Goodyear would lose by taking \$1.8 million in Scenario 1A over the \$2.1 million in Mr. Crossman's recommendation, but they support Scenario #1A for the betterment of all.

Mr. Crossman noted that Goodyear would receive \$1.8 million in the \$1 million base proposal. Mr. Fischbach stated that the way he read it, under Scenario #1A, Goodyear would receive \$1.83 million and under the amended motion, Goodyear would receive \$2.116 million. Mr. Crossman noted that Mr. Fischbach was using the revised table that distributed all of the funds with a \$1 million base, not as he proposed, which was to use the original table that distributed the \$88 million with a \$1 million base and then allocate the extra \$15.9 million to the nine communities.

Ms. Yazzie clarified that the agenda packet material, dated March 3, 2009, showed Scenarios #1A and #1B with a total of \$88.7 million, and the material that was emailed to members March 10th showed Scenarios #1A and #1B with a total of \$104.6 million. Ms. Yazzie stated that Mr. Crossman is referencing the March 3 Scenario #1A amount of \$88.7 million and is asking that the

base of \$1 million be used and the additional funds of \$15.9 million be distributed to the nine communities.

Mr. Fischbach asked if the motion was based on the March 10, 2009, material. Ms. Yazzie replied that was correct. She clarified that the information she gave in her presentation and the scenario in Mr. Swenson's motion, Scenario #1A, includes a \$500,000 base, dated March 10, 2009.

Vice Chair Pentz recognized public comment from Margarita Garcia from Guadalupe. She said that she keeps hearing the word "city" and asked about small towns. Ms. Garcia stated that small towns have needs and are neglected in big projects. She said that it is important when making decisions that towns are included. Vice Chair Pentz clarified that the Town of Guadalupe was included in the motion.

With no further discussion, Vice Chair Pentz called for a vote taken on the amended motion. The amended motion failed, with Mr. Anderson, Mr. Rodriguez, Mr. White, Mr. Pettit, Ms. Arellano, Mr. Crossman, Mr. Edwards, and Ms. Robinson voting yes.

The vote on the motion made by Mr. Swenson and seconded by Mr. Fischbach passed, with Mr. Rodriguez, Ms. Blazina, and Mr. Crossman voting no.

Ms. Yazzie noted that next steps in the process include continuing work with RPTA, and targeting the March and April MAG committee meetings for approval of the sub-allocation projects. She advised that due to the short timeframe there is the possibility of additional or adjusted meeting dates and times.

6C. MAG Regional Portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act -Transit

Ms. Yazzie reported on the Transit portion of the MAG Regional Portion of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. She said that the focus of her presentation was the status of MAG Regional Transit portion of ARRA and next steps, and noted that RPTA staff was available for any questions. Ms. Yazzie stated that \$65 million is dedicated to the MAG region for transit projects. She noted that on March 5, 2009, the Federal Transit Administration released the final funding allocation, which means the clock started ticking that day for RPTA's requirement to obligate 50 percent of its funds in 180 days. Ms. Yazzie added that RPTA has one year to obligate 100 percent of the funds.

Ms. Yazzie reported that on February 19, 2009, the RPTA Board of Directors recommended criteria for project selection that includes Proposition 400 projects; construction projects or projects that generate significant local job creation; ready to go projects; project size (larger is better); projects that may not qualify for federal funds; and projects that typically receive less federal funding.

Ms. Yazzie stated that on March 4, 2009, the RPTA Management Committee reviewed and discussed extensively the ARRA project list for funding and recommended projects that met the approved criteria for review by the RPTA Board of Directors. She noted that a 19-page

memorandum from RPTA was at each place. Ms. Yazzie displayed the recommended list of projects.

Ms. Yazzie stated that on March 6, 2009, the RPTA Budget and Finance Subcommittee met. She said that the Chair requested alternative funding scenarios be developed, and these are found on pages 13 to 18 of the RPTA memorandum.

Ms. Yazzie stated that this item is anticipated to be on the March 19, 2009, RPTA Board of Directors agenda for a recommendation to MAG for inclusion in the Transportation Improvement Program. Vice Chair Pentz thanked Ms. Yazzie for her report. No questions from the Committee were noted.

7. Project Changes – Administrative Modification to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program for Funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009

Ms. Yazzie reported that this item requests action to make administrative modifications to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2007 Update for funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. She noted that the projects were referenced by Mr. Anderson in his presentation for agenda item #6A, and are the Highway projects approved by the MAG Regional Council for the ADOT portion of the ARRA funds. Vice Chair Pentz thanked Ms. Yazzie for her presentation and asked if there were any questions. None were noted. No requests for public comment were received.

Mr. Pettit moved to recommend approval of administrative modifications to the FY 2008-2012 MAG Transportation Improvement Program, and as appropriate, to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2007 Update for funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Mr. Swenson seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

8. Census 2010 Outreach Efforts

Kelly Taft, MAG Communications Manager, provided an update on census outreach activities, and noted that direction was requested from the Committee in terms of funding for paid advertising efforts that are expected to take place in our region over the next year.

Ms. Taft stated that the 2010 Census will be April 1, 2010, and she noted that census data are used to determine the allocation of more than \$300 billion in federal funds to states and communities every year and determine the apportionment of Congressional seats. Ms. Taft added that census data are also used for emergency planning.

Ms. Taft noted that one of the biggest changes in Census 2010 is that everyone will receive the short form; the long form is now handled through the annual American Community Survey. Ms. Taft stated that address listers are in the field now and member agency Public Information Officers are notifying law enforcement agencies that they could possibly receive suspicious person calls.

Ms. Taft noted that the Bureau of the Census has the responsibility for developing an advertising campaign. She noted that at each place was a revised Media Buys Proposal, which reflected costs lower than in the original proposal.

Ms. Taft noted that the proposal consists of Idea One and Idea Two. She explained that Idea One is the least costly of the two approaches at a little more than \$327,000 and Idea Two is about \$426,000. She then provided a breakdown of each option in the categories of general media, Spanish media, and other minority media. Ms. Taft noted that the primary difference between the two ideas is that Idea Two includes network television purchases along with radio, cable, and print advertising buys, and ads in community sections of the newspapers that Idea One does not include.

Ms. Taft stated that the advertising campaign, which will cover the entire Valley using all stations and formats, is targeted for a five-week period beginning the first week of March. She advised that they will be approaching the stations for value-added matches.

Ms. Taft stated that accurate population counts are critical to MAG's transportation modeling efforts and for conducting effective planning. She said that this year, due to the extraordinary fiscal challenges facing the local governments, MAG asked the Federal Highway Administration if a portion of the MAG federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds can be used to pay for 50 percent of the costs for these outreach-related expenses. Ms. Taft noted that the FHWA has responded that it will allow MAG to use its federal STP planning funds for half of the census advertising costs, with an understanding that the MAG federal funds portion would not exceed \$234,500, which is half of the highest number in the original proposal. She pointed out the chart on the last page of the agenda material that showed each member agency's share of the media commitment per scenario.

Ms. Taft pointed out that the federal stimulus dollars might be directed to the census for marketing efforts, and if the Census Bureau pays for broadcast advertising in the region, these dollars would be applied toward costs.

Ms. Taft stated that the outreach group met on March 5th and unanimously preferred Idea Two, because they felt television buys would be the most effective in reaching residents. Ms. Taft noted that the Town Manager for Fountain Hills could not be at the Management Committee meeting, and called to pass along the Town's support for Idea Two.

Ms. Taft noted that the media buys do not represent the total commitment a jurisdiction may have to provide for local outreach, and they may want to include local outreach as a portion of their budgets. She advised that the costs in the proposal could change because standard advertising rates can fluctuate daily and the numbers could be higher or lower. Ms. Taft noted, however, that the paid advertising would remain within the overall approved program funding amount.

Mr. Pettit expressed his appreciation to Mr. Fairbanks for stepping forward, taking the lead, and making the City of Phoenix resources available to the rest of the region. Mr. Pettit stated that he did not see any payment or assistance to the City of Phoenix to do the Channel 11 pieces, and asked if this was included in the proposal. Ms. Taft replied that the census groups discussed using

the Phoenix or the MAG video capabilities, or city cable channels doing their own productions. She explained that a number of Phoenix subcommittee members represent a number of stations in the Valley, and they suggested the subcommittee provide them with scripts and allow them to produce the spots using their own talent.

Mr. Meyer said that he was not sure he knew the difference between Ideas One and Two, as they relate to Spanish language television. He indicated that they looked the same. Ms. Taft replied that he was correct, they are the same. She added that the difference is in the network buys and they would still be doing the same amount of Spanish television and print buys in both Ideas One and Two.

Mr. Bacon stated his agreement with Mr. Pettit's comments to the City of Phoenix. He expressed his support for Idea One, and encouraged that the group come back with an option, perhaps Idea One-A that increases outreach to all groups, which includes not only minority media, but also new media, such as the Internet, cable, etc. He indicated that he thought there was a third idea that was between Idea One and Idea Two.

David Ramirez, Deputy Public Information Officer for the City of Phoenix, asked for clarification if Mr. Bacon was referring to such media as Facebook and Twitter. Mr. Bacon replied that was correct. Mr. Ramirez stated that the media committee recommended looking into that, and that Phoenix is developing a social media policy. He added that this plan does not reflect all of the free media, especially the Spanish media. He said that there could be opportunities through columns in La Voz and Prensa Hispana newspapers, radio shows on Campesina and La Nueva, and a TV telethon on Univision. Mr. Ramirez advised that Univision's participation pledge would cost about \$80,000 in other markets, and added that he knew of no other place in the county that has a television partnership. He said that there is a lot of media not included in this plan that will be available.

Mr. Bacon stated that in past censuses, the major network affiliates gave a large amount of free media in terms of feature and new stories. He expressed that part of his concern was based on putting an extra \$100,000 toward that which might be provided at no cost. Mr. Ramirez replied that they could look at that, but our media subcommittee includes representatives from all major channels. They have been receptive to promoting the census, not only with paid outreach, but also with unpaid news stories and features. Mr. Ramirez stated that these representatives are on our team, so it is safe to assume we will get coverage.

Ms. Dennis asked if the print buys would include the Northwest Valley. Mr. Ramirez replied that the print buys include all community sections.

Dennis Smith stated that the request today is to identify the amount for the media buys so that when jurisdictions are building their budgets, they will have two years to cover their commitment. Mr. Smith noted that staff could come back with more on the proposal at a future meeting, but this item was to let members know the amount as soon as possible.

Mr. Pettit asked the status of promotional items for community events, which were successful in prior censuses. Ms. Taft replied that two other subcommittees are working on marketing

materials, and she expected the Census Bureau might also be providing materials. Ms. Taft commented that members might want to include the cost of promotional materials in their budgets, and she noted that the cost for media advertising is not expected to impact municipal budgets until March 2010.

Mr. Pettit moved to recommend that Idea Two for the 2010 Census advertising costs be chosen and that the FY 2009 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget be amended to use MAG Federal Highway Administration STP funds not to exceed \$234,500 to pay for half of the 2010 Census advertising costs, with the understanding that if federal stimulus funds are received for this purpose, a commensurate reduction would be made to the request for funding. Mr. Fairbanks seconded.

Vice Chair Pentz expressed his appreciation to Mr. Pettit for all of his current and past work on Census counts in the region. He asked members if they had any discussion of the motion.

Mr. Little expressed his support for Idea Two, and said that he thought that alternative approaches to reaching the population, including young people, needed to be considered. He commented that the program should not look old school, and he noted that the 18- to 20-year-olds get their information in other ways.

With no further discussion, the vote on the motion passed, with Mr. Bacon voting no.

9. Development of the FY 2010 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget

Becky Kimbrough, MAG Fiscal Services Manager, stated that the development of the FY 2010 draft budget has been on the Management Committee, Executive Committee, and Regional Council agendas beginning in January 2009. Ms. Kimbrough noted that the draft budget is about 70 percent complete, and noted that a copy of the Work Program and the "MAG Programs in Brief" were included in the agenda packet.

Ms. Kimbrough stated that the Intermodal Planning Group meeting, which provides a forum for MAG as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), transit operators and Federal agencies to discuss planning issues, is scheduled for April 17th at the MAG office. She said that an update from this meeting will be provided to the Management Committee at the May meeting.

Ms. Kimbrough stated that the draft MAG Programs in Brief includes a narrative of the 16 proposed new projects for FY 2010, which were first presented in the February agenda packets. She noted that the new projects were presented at the February 19th MAG Budget Webinar presentation which is held each year for MAG members to give and receive early information and member input on the MAG draft budget.

Ms. Kimbrough stated that MAG is recommending no increase in staff salaries in the FY 2010 draft budget. She noted a correction in the Programs in Brief to adjust the number of Human Services staff positions from four staff to five staff.

Ms. Kimbrough stated that MAG includes a 15 percent contingency in the budget to have flexibility in its budget to address future issues. She noted that the current estimate for contingency is about \$1.5 million.

Ms. Kimbrough stated that in the past, the estimates for the MAG Dues and Assessments have been based on the consumer price index for all urban areas. She explained that in the FY 2009 Work Program, due to economic conditions, MAG recommended that dues and assessments not be increased, and for FY 2010, MAG is recommending that dues and assessments be reduced by 50 percent. Ms. Kimbrough added that any changes to individual members are due to population shifts.

Ms. Kimbrough stated that work continues on the draft budget and updates will be provided at the April meeting, with a request for approval in May. Vice Chair Pentz thanked Ms. Kimbrough for her report and asked members if they had questions.

Mr. Little said that a lot of the program areas are predicated on the assumption of population growth, while some economists are predicting a decrease in Arizona's population over the next 20 years. Mr. Little added that he did not know if this will be true for Maricopa County, but he requested that these underlying assumptions be reviewed for those types of programs in light of this economy.

Mr. Fairbanks commented that some indicators say that the population has already decreased. He then commended Mr. Smith and MAG staff for being proactive in lowering the MAG budget and trying to reduce costs to member agencies by decreasing the dues and assessments.

10. Legislative Update

Nathan Pryor, MAG Senior Policy Planner, provided an update on legislative issues of interest. He reported that on the federal side, the final FY 2009 Omnibus Appropriations Bill was passed late on the evening of March 10, and it is expected that the President will sign it. Mr. Pryor stated that transportation will receive 4.9 percent more than in FY 2008. He noted a \$3.5 million earmark for Arizona, which is the Phoenix to Tucson Commuter Rail Study, and commented that staff will continue to look through the bill for any other earmarks that could come to Arizona.

Mr. Pryor stated that the President's budget framework includes a 2.5 percent increase for the US Department of Transportation, but this amount decreases in the outer years. Mr. Pryor stated that the National Surface Transportation Financing Commission report pushes for a short-term fix in the gas tax with an increase of 10 cents per gallon on regular gas and 15 cents per gallon on diesel, and for the long-term, a mileage-based fee. Mr. Pryor stated that the White House Press Secretary was not supportive, but the option may be revisited.

Mr. Pryor reported on State legislation. He said that the FY 2010 budget has dominated work at the Legislature, and there has been slow movement on both the House and Senate sides. He noted that he is tracking three public private partnership bills: Senate Bill 1261 and Senate Bill 1463, both of which have stalled as legislators work on the FY 2010 budget. Mr. Pryor stated that

House Bill 2396 is a strike-everything amendment and is still being analyzed by staff to determine its meaning to the MAG region.

11. Comments from the Committee

An opportunity will be provided for Management Committee members to present a brief summary of current events. The Management Committee is not allowed to propose, discuss, deliberate or take action at the meeting on any matter in the summary, unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

No comments from the Committee were noted.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

Secretary

Chairman